UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/811,823	03/30/2004	Masayoshi Yamano	50395-265	3063
McDERMOTT	7590 01/31/2007 , WILL & EMERY		50395-265 3063 EXAMINER EASHOO, MARK	INER
600 13th Street	, N.W.		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Washington, D	C 20005-3096			
			1732	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE
3 MO	NTHS	01/31/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

				,			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
	10/811,823	YAMANO ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.	1732					
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	ppears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence ad	ldress				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY TO BE A STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING IDENTIFY TO BE A STATE OF THE MAILING IDENTIFY THE MA	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed to the second will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the text of the second ABANDONE	N. mely filed the mailing date of this on ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 I	November 2006.						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowed	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.	•				
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are pending in the application.							
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra	awn from consideration.						
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.	·						
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-5</u> is/are rejected.							
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	or election requirement.						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin	er.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		•	, ,				
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	Examiner. Note the attached Office	: Action or form PT	O-152.				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	n priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
 ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 	nts have been received.						
2. Certified copies of the priority documen	• •						
3. Copies of the certified copies of the price		ed in this National	Stage				
application from the International Burea							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a lis	t of the certified copies not receive	∌d.					
Attachment(s)	•						
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	/ (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail D	ate					
 Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2 ea.</u>. 	5) Motice of Informal F 6) Other:	ratent Application					

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

The information disclosure statements filed 20-JUL-2004 and 08-NOV-2006 comply with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97, 1.98 and MPEP § 609. Accordingly, they have been placed in the application file and the information referred to therein has been considered as to the merits.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Kusakari et al. (US 2003/00725545 A1) in view of Nakasone et al. (US Pat. 4,725,453).

Kusakari et al. teaches the claimed process of making an optical cable, comprising: extruding a thermoplastic resin around at least one tension member, which is a FRP containing aramid fibers, and at least one optical fiber (paras. 63-66); and wherein an adhesive/sizing is applied to the aramid tension fibers (para. 71).

Kusakari et al. does not teach a FRP made using a matrix containing styrene. However, Nakasone et al. teaches a FRP made using a matrix containing styrene (1:10-25 and 2:30-50). Kusakari et al. and Nakasone et al. are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, namely, making optical cables. At the time of invention a person of ordinary skill in the art would have formed used a FRP made using a matrix containing styrene, as taught by Nakasone et al., in the process of Kusakari et al., and would have been motivated to do so to because Nakasone et al. suggests that these materials are used for economic benefit, namely, using materials that are low-cost.

Generally, differences in concentration or temperature will not support the patentability of subject matter encompassed by the prior art unless there is evidence indicating such concentration or temperature is critical. "[W]here the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation." In re Aller, 220 F.2d 454, 456, 105 USPQ 233, 235 (CCPA 1955). In this instance, the instantly claimed materials and general extrusion process are taught by Kusakari et al. and Nakasone et al. Even though the instant processing temperature range is not specifically taught by the references, it is submitted that a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found

Art Unit: 1732

it obvious to have optimized the extrusion temperature, as commonly practiced in the art, in the process of Kusakari et al.. in order to provide optimum extrusion performance of the materials.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See attached PTO-892.

Correspondence

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark Eashoo, Ph.D. whose telephone number is (571) 272-1197. The examiner can normally be reached on 7am-3pm EST, Monday - Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Johnson can be reached on (571) 272-1176. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark Eashoo, Ph.D.

25/JAN 07

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1732

January 29, 2007